

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 17, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 19-32 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 8, and 19 are independent. In the Office Action dated April 17, 2007, Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 19-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-5, 8-15, 19-29, and 31-32 remain in this application with Claims 16 and 30 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated April 17, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 8-16, and 19-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,711,608 ("*Ogilvie*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,786 ("*Fox*") further in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2001/0030960 ("*Nakada*"). Claims 1, 8, and 19 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for, at least for the reason that it recites, for example, "providing a security warning message when it is determined that the electronic mail address is located on the network beyond the sender's home domain, the security warning message indicating that the self-destructing electronic mail message is about to be sent to the network beyond the

sender's home domain; receiving a response to the security warning message; canceling, when the response indicates that a user does not want to proceed, ... transmitting, when the response indicates that the user wants to proceed." Amended Claims 8 and 19 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification at least on page 13, lines 5-10.

Consistent with embodiments of the invention, in an event that an e-mail client application determines that one or more intended recipients are located on a network beyond a sender's home domain, a security warning message may be displayed. (See specification, page 13, line 7-10.) A user may have an option to proceed with sending a self-destructing e-mail message or canceling the e-mail message. (See specification, page 13, line 14-15.) This may allow the user to ensure that a receiving e-mail client application supports self-destructing e-mail messages. (See specification, page 13, line 17-19.)

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *Ogilvie* and *Fox* at least do not disclose determining if an electronic mail address is located on a network beyond a sender's home domain and canceling the electronic mail message to the intended recipient whose electronic mail address is located on the network beyond the sender's home domain. (See Office Action page 4, lines 11-15.) Because *Ogilvie* and *Fox* do not disclose the aforementioned determining and canceling stages, *Ogilvie* and *Fox* cannot disclose: i) providing a security warning message in response to the determining stage; ii) receiving a response to the security warning message; and iii) canceling or transmitting the electronic mail message based on the received response.

Furthermore, *Nakada* does not overcome *Ogilvie*'s and *Fox*'s deficiencies. *Nakada* merely discloses that because an electronic mail address "hanako@server2.fujitsu.co.jp" of a terminal apparatus T3 includes a domain name "fujitsu.co.jp" indicating a transmission available area, according to *Nakada*, it remains in a destination list. (See paragraph [0125], lines 11-16.) On the other hand, *Nakada* also discloses that since the electronic mail address "saburo@mail.hokano.co.jp" of a terminal apparatus T5 does not include the domain name "fujitsu.co.jp", it is deleted from the destination list and registered in a destination deletion list. (See paragraph [0125], lines 16-21.) Consequently, like *Ogilvie* and *Fox*, *Nakada* does not disclose providing a security warning message indicating that an electronic mail message is about to be sent to a network beyond a sender's home domain. Furthermore, *Nakada* does not disclose receiving a response to the security warning message and canceling or transmitting the electronic mail message based on the received response. Rather *Nakada* merely discloses that if a terminal apparatus does not include a particular domain name, it is deleted from a destination list and registered in a destination deletion list.

Combining *Ogilvie* with *Fox* and *Nakada* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Ogilvie*, *Fox*, and *Nakada*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "providing a security warning message when it is determined that the electronic mail address is located on the network beyond the sender's home domain, the security warning message indicating that the self-destructing electronic mail message is about to be sent to the network beyond the sender's home domain; receiving a response to the security warning message; canceling, when the response

indicates that a user does not want to proceed, ... transmitting, when the response indicates that the user wants to proceed," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 8 and 19 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 8, and 19 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 8, and 19.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 9-15, 20-29, and 31-32 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 8, and 19, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 8, and 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-5, 9-15, 20-29, and 31-32.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: July 12, 2007

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

